# Health Professions Workforce Data Workgroup – Recommendations – DRAFT

Four state-level strategies for collection of workforce data:

1. Each licensure Board independently collects core (defined based on each Board's mission and any mandates) data elements and submits an extract for State Reporting purposes. Other elements needed for state workforce planning and improvement require additional surveys or data collection case-by-case.
2. Each licensure Board independently collects both core and augmented data elements agreed to based on multi-stakeholder consensus at state level and submits an extract to the State.
3. Each licensure Board independently collects only core elements. Augmented data elements are collected in a centralized manner by a third party. Standardized data extracts from the Boards are merged with the augmented dataset (either by third party vendor or a State agency) and made available with any aggregation/de-identification as needed for workforce planning purposes.
4. All core and augmented data elements needed for workforce planning are collected by a single, state-level "clearing house" mechanism,. For maximum cost-effectiveness, this is desirably fully integrated with broader state government information systems (e.g. driver licensing, tax filing, etc. as in the case of the Texas Online e-Government website). Data is made available to the Licensure Boards as well as to other parties with appropriate aggregation/ de-identification.

Table 1:  Comparison between Strategies

| # | Strategy | Pros | Cons | Notes |
|---|----------|------|------|-------|
| 1 | Each licensure Board independently collects core (defined based on each Board's mission) data elements and submits an extract for State Reporting purposes.  Other elements needed for state workforce planning and improvement require additional surveys or data collection case-by-case. | • Each Board can independently control its data collection | • Multiple data vendor contracts imply contract management overhead and potential  data standardization challenges between different Boards | Current Kansas mechanism |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Each licensure Board independently collects both core and augmented data elements agreed to based on multi-stakeholder consensus at state level and submits an extract to the State. | • Leverage of existing Board-professional data collection channels | • Same as for #1, plus:<br>• Collection of certain sensitive elements (e.g. race/ethnicity) could open Boards to criticism about potential discrimination in granting licenses.<br>• Changes to the augmented data set require all Boards to consistently make changes with their vendors | |
| 3 | Each licensure Board independently collects only core elements. Augmented data elements are collected in a centralized manner by a third party. Standardized data extracts from the Boards are merged with the augmented dataset (either by third party vendor or a State agency) and made available with any aggregation/de-identification as needed for workforce planning purposes. | • Offers Boards protection from discriminatory lawsuits<br>• Changes to the augmented data set could be made in a centralized manner thereby avoiding change control costs and ensuring consistency across Boards | • Does not resolve the issue of multiple Board-vendor relationships requiring duplicative overhead costs across Boards. | Preferred short/intermediate-term solution |
| 4 | All core and augmented data elements needed for workforce planning are collected by a single, state- | • Optimal cost savings due to | • Requires upfront investment in | Long-term solution because of "lock-in" of |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| level "clearing house" mechanism,. For maximum cost-effectiveness, this is desirably fully integrated with broader state government information systems (e.g. driver licensing, tax filing, etc. as in the case of the Texas Online e-Government website). Data is made available to the Licensure Boards as well as to other parties with appropriate aggregation/ de-identification. | centralized information system procurement and administration (elimination of duplicative overheads) | developing standardized formats and larger scale IT procurement | various Boards with respect to data vendor contracts |

**Workgroup Recommendations:**

1. Strategy #3 (Core data collection by licensure Boards and centralized augmented dataset collection by third party) appears to be the most feasible solution in the short/intermediate term.
2. Core data collection needs standardization for consistency across Boards
3. Licensure data collection could benefit by leveraging other workforce-related data feeds such as CAQH credentialing dataset, other surveys/studies conducted by professional associations, HIE/HIT surveys as part of the HITECH initiative, etc.
4. The possibility of leveraging HITECH ARRA funds for improvement of the licensure database needs to be explored
5. Strategy #4 (Centralized clearing house approach) could be pursued for long-term savings and streamlining of state government data collection in the future.